

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. I.

SALEM, O., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1845.

NO. 11.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

Published every Friday at

SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., O.

JAMES BARNABY, Jr., General Agent

BENJAMIN S. JONES,

J. ELIZABETH HITCHCOCK, Editors

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.

TERMS:—\$1.50 per annum, or \$3.00 if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing.

Advertisements making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents—one square \$1.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE:—Sam'l Brooke, George Garrison, James Barnaby, Jr., David L. Galbreath, Lot Holmes.

J. H. PAINTER, PRINTER.

EXTRACTS FROM A SPEECH OF WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

After a few words expressing his happiness in meeting the abolitionists of Eastern Pennsylvania, his brethren as the children of a common father, and his brethren also as engaged in a common cause and impelled by common desires for the triumph of truth, and right, and for the slave's deliverance, the speaker went on to remark upon the solemnity and importance of the question before them. We should not act rashly, he said, there should be nothing impulsive in our movements. Not that we should wait to know what affect our course may have on ourselves—our case or prosperity or good name. I know, when such considerations can make us hesitate about advancing in the path of duty. We should ask only what is right!—not what is politic!—or popular! We are not to follow the multitude to do evil.

I see a large portion of those before me, who ought to be disunionists; who, though their rights are as dear and as precious as ours, are treated as non-entities by your government, and by your political parties. Whigs and Democrats profess with equal zeal to go for equal political rights, but both unite in depriving half the race of their rights. And Liberty party differs not in the least from the other parties, as to its practical contempt of women. That government has no just authority but what it derives from the consent of the governed, is a principle laid down, not by reckless fanatics, but by the greatest statesmen of the country. It is the Nation's avowed doctrine, yet in defiance the government claims and exercises authority over those whose consent has never been given or asked. How can Christians or patriots support such a government?

Who are most likely to be blinded in regard to this question?—and who are most likely to be impartial? For the union are those who are willing to remain in political association with the profligate and the unprincipled, that they may obtain political power. They want the power, they say, which cannot else be obtained, but they want it to make a good use of it. Be it so, yet I fear the man who wants power. For what does he want it? To make me do what he thinks is right, not what my own conscience requires of me. They who defend the Constitution are on the side of honor and emolument, and men love these. Their course puts them in the way to their own preferment, ours cuts us off from all chance of preferment, with its emoluments and honors, other things being equal then, they are likely to be blinded rather than we.

It has been said or intimated, that we have no right to introduce the Non-Resistant question here. But they who say this, have introduced it; we have not. The Non-Resistant question is not involved in that which we are now discussing. It is not whether we shall go for no government, but whether we shall support this government. We stand in regard to this matter, where the Covenanters do, and they are far enough from being Non-Resistant.

If any are here who are not abolitionists, if any who are abolitionists only when it is popular to be such, if any who are abolitionists only so far as they can thereby promote their own interests, or any who instead of taking truth for their guide, follow any man as an oracle; to them I make no appeal; I speak only to those who mean to follow the truth at whatever cost, for there is need now of a firm trust in God, and resolute purpose to abide by the right. Times more trying than our fathers saw, await us, and we are to pass through a more severe ordeal of our faith in God and trust in man, than any to which they were called. Hence none will rally with us around this banner but those who are ready to hear it onward through persecution and reproach, for if the cause is to advance they must go forward.

All abolitionists are agreed as to the principles of abolitionism; the right of all men to be free; the sinfulness of slaveholding; the duty of immediate emancipation; but in the application of these principles we are not all agreed. There is a wide and honest difference of opinion; and this should not excite surprise, for the minds of men are not alike in their growth. Though all should start together, yet some must go forward. There is no occasion for imputing to each a heresey

motives for such differences. The true man does not wince at the dissent or the rebukes of his associates, but relies on his being in the right, and if unjustly accused does not cry out impatiently and fly into a passion.

All concede that it is not enough to denounce the system of slavery as sinful. The slaveholders themselves can do that. They admit it is wrong and a curse, but all that is not enough to abolish it. War is everywhere admitted to be a great evil, but still the work of slaughter goes on, and men train themselves to engage in it. But to make our principles of any avail, we must hold them practically, and not in the abstract merely. It is a serious question, who are the friends of liberty? Are all who profess to be? No. The American people profess republicanism, but in their practice are a brood of robbers. We cannot take their professions on trust. If the State claims to be republican, we will explain it by the light of republican principles, and if its practice is at war with its profession, we will brand it as despotic. If the church claims to be anti-slavery, we will try it by the law of God, and if it cannot abide that, we will treat it as anti-Christian and diabolical.

We are connected with various associations, political and religious, and it is hard to give them up. Here comes a strong temptation to do wrong for the sake of remaining in them; to go with the multitude to do evil, rather than stand alone or with the despised few for the right, and forego the connections which have been so dear to us. But we must resist all such temptation if we would be faithful to the cause of the slave, and successful in laboring for his deliverance.

I stand here to affirm that in saying, that consistency with our principle requires us to withdraw from the pro-slavery organizations of the country, not excepting its pro-slavery government, I bring in no proscription doctrine, nor one which is invidious to any one on the anti-slavery platform. I hold to the largest liberty on that platform, for all who believe in the right of the slave to be free immediately. They may differ as to the mode of action, and each has a right to undertake his own chosen method. Some believe in the use of free produce, as an important means of aiding the cause, and regard abstinence from the products of slave labor, as an anti-slavery duty. They have a right to express that opinion, and to do it in no proscription of those who do not adopt it.

So of our own course in relation to political parties. Shall the Whig or the Democratic abolitionist say that we are proscriptive, because we declare it to be inconsistent with anti-slavery principles to act with those parties while they remain in a pro-slavery position, or to support their pro-slavery candidates? Nay; he interposes with his rights as an abolitionist, if he prevents me from speaking such a sentiment, and if he runs off because I speak it, he shows that he cannot remain where the truth is spoken. But it is called proscription, to say that the Constitution is a bloody compact; a league with oppression, which we ought not to support or sanction by our oaths or votes. We must not call abolitionists inconsistent when they swear to support such a pro-slavery Constitution. I do not assent to this doctrine. I thank any man who faithfully rebukes my inconsistency. The life of our cause is in our willingness to hear all, in the spirit of manly honesty.

We have often adopted resolutions that it is not consistent for abolitionists to belong to the Whig and Democratic parties, on account of their pro-slavery character; and now some of the same persons who have advocated these resolutions, condemn us for saying it is inconsistent for them to belong to a pro-slavery confederacy, and promise support to a pro-slavery Constitution. They accuse us of doing the same thing in principle, which New Organization did in 1839 and 1840, when it sought to force upon the Anti-Slavery society, the doctrine of the rightfulness of human governments and the duty of voting to create and uphold them;—matters on which it was not our province to decide either way. But the charge is unjust, for we do not teach the duty of not voting, or that human government is wrong and ought not to be supported; we only say that abolitionists cannot consistently vote for, create, or support a pro-slavery government. This is a purely Anti-slavery doctrine.

From the Arena.

LIBERTY PARTY IN CONNECTICUT.

Mr. Editor:—I wish to address a few thoughts to the Abolitionists, and people in Windham county, through the columns of your paper with reference to the Liberty Party Association, recently held in Danielsonville, and my attendance as an anti-slavery man. The "Christian Freeman" incidentally came into my hands, and I found an invitation to "every anti-slavery man and woman who can attend, to appear at a Liberty Association of Windham county, armed and equipped with courage and zeal commensurate with the work before them." I have been actively engaged, as an enemy to American Slavery, in the field in open opposition to it for the last seven or eight years. I have warred against slavery in season and out of season—it all times—in all places without ceasing. This I need not tell of; it is well known; my life has been a "living epistle against slavery, known and read of all men."

When I engaged in the anti-slavery enterprise, it was with a principle of right, against an enormously wicked system of wrong and outrage. I entered the field as

an uncompromising enemy to slavery, for the campaign, be it long or short. I little understood at the time the strength of the foe with which I had made war—how many strong holds—fortifications and covers, it had; how it had endeared itself and obtained a strong foothold in every class of society. Clinging myself with the panoply of truth—I went forth with the liberal spear and commenced an attack. I followed the enemy into the whig and democratic parties, and heard its friends crying "this is not the greatest evil!"—we are choosing the least of evils." I made no compromise—I followed on and the enemy fled into the Church, Theological schools and Ecclesiastical bodies which shut their doors upon me—saying "touch not the Lord's anointed; you are going to excite and divide the church, and destroy the ministry." I made no compromise. I followed the enemy on into the very citadel of the government—in to their very frame work—and found its vital and animating spirit slavery. I applied my principle of right. I have made no compromise—no union with slavery—and I hear God saying to all, "your covenant with death and agreement with hell shall be disannulled."

I was educated an orthodox congregationalist—and to believe that every principle of right was given to us as a rule of conduct, and that it is the duty of all to apply these principles to every thing and to every body, and wherever would not stand the test, to regard it as wrong and unworthy of countenance. Thus I have rigidly, conscientiously, and unflinchingly applied my anti-slavery principles—to the people, the parties, the church, clergy, theological and religious institutions, and to the government, and I found their "power on the side of the oppressor—while the poor slave had no comfort." I am a comecouter from the whig and democratic parties, because they are slaveholding. I must be without partiality and hypocrisy. I am a comecouter from the church, because as James G. Birney says, it is "the bulwark of American Slavery," and God says "come out of her, that ye partake not of her sins and receive not of her plagues." I come out from the clergy, because they baptize and sanctify slavery, and as Gerrit Smith says, as a body constitute the most corrupt and abandoned set of men in the land. I come out from the government, because it has entered into a slaveholding, slave-trading, slave-selling compact—a covenant with death and an agreement with hell—and no one can be other than a comecouter from it, who is an abolitionist. And now I must not shrink from applying my principles to the so termed Liberty Party—the members of which profess to be opposed to Slavery. I find it very ready to admit my principle of right and apply it to the whig and democratic parties, and unite with me in crying come out—be ye separate from them—to recognize no man as anti-slavery, who continue in connection and labor with them—as did Porter, Ainsworth, also Booth, Hammond at the Liberty Party meeting—and here we part. I ask them to make the like impartial application of their principles to the American Church—"the bulwark of slavery"—which sanctifies the system; and they cry hands off—you wish to "abolish the church"—"you hate the church"—"your object is to destroy the church under the garb of anti-slavery." Such charges were used by Porter, Booth, and the clergy present. Thus the church sanctifies and defends slavery; and the Liberty Party is in full league with the church, crying against come-out-ism; defending the church, whigs and democrats, by it to get their votes—to get office and power.

The politics of the Liberty party can be no better than their religion, and that is slave holding. Its leaders carefully avoid the church question in its relation to slavery—they will talk about every other obstacle but that of the church—as Porter and his fellow laborers did at Danielsonville—and if others introduce the church, they defend her—daub her over—call her anti-slavery—as Porter and Ainsworth did—and offer you a rebuke as Booth and Porter and others did me for introducing the subject.

The church is in league with slavery, and Liberty party in league with the church—and the latter more criminal than the former because of its light and professions. It is under the necessity of being so to get votes. Porter "let the cat out of the bag"—to the chagrin of Liberty party leaders. He undertook in common with other leading Liberty party spirits to put a padlock upon my lips—but their presiding officer, and a majority of the meeting, were not so lost to anti-slavery principles, to allow it—they have unwittingly been cajoled into the party, and without fairly seeing their position, united with the party to vote—slavery down. The leading spirits must keep them in, and to do so know they must keep dark. Mr. Porter, I should have said Rev. James Porter, presiding Elder in the Meth. Epis. Church (a church rotten with slavery from centre to circumference)—author of a work against come-outism—emphatically enjoined upon the Liberty party to countenance no free discussion meetings. He would not engage in them—neither would the clergy and church; and they had stood aloof from the cause in consequence of them; they would not attend, to be abused, traduced, rebuked; and he also emphatically said "depend upon me, if you open your doors to free discussion, you will make but a very few converts." Cry heard! Yes free discussion is death to the Liberty party—for it is a slaveholding party, uniting with the church

to sanctify slavery—and the government to defend it, and protect it, and the truth is its only antidote; it swears to do so at any rate—and if it takes the oath to get into office, merely, it is the meanest kind of perjury. If it takes the oath to support the Constitution with a mental reservation, as Mr. Birney says he is prepared to do—it indicates a laxity of morals—a moral degeneracy which would cause even slavery to blush for shame. If it swears to support the constitution (an instrument of authority—a rule of conduct—for every member of the government with all the other members)—claiming the right of individual interpretation, when the bargain—the compact provides the interpreting power, and makes their decision law—then Liberty party is truly a disorganizing, no-government party—for if we have fifteen millions of interpreters of the Constitution—it has no meaning—no force—no authority—and we have no government—it is nullified. These individual interpreters are nullifiers, to all intents and purposes—Liberty party men are in an awkward dilemma—crying, come out from the whig and democratic parties—refusing to vote for any one of those parties, whether he be deacon, elder, bishop, minister, or layman—but advocating union with and support of those very men in the church. The Congregational and Methodist ministers in Danielsonville were present, to hear the claims of Liberty party upon them and their churches for their votes. I suppose they had been made to understand that they would be in no danger of getting a rebuke, as the leading spirits of the meeting were Reverends; i. e., Rev. James Porter, Rev. Charles Ainsworth, Rev. Mr. Ous, Rev. Mr. Hammond, Rev. Sherman M. Booth—all in the church. I infer it from the fact that the Congregational minister fled, when his church was being called in question, and the fact held up that all the meeting houses in the village were closed, and the meeting had to be held in a mechanic's shop. I infer it from the dagger looking countenances of the priests and their attempts to defend these churches. I infer it from the declarations of Porter, endorsed by the silent assent of all the other speakers—that free discussion meetings would not answer their purpose—they would not make many converts. I infer it from the declaration of Porter that if the whigs and democrats would come and sit in silence and hear him he would convert one half them, if they, like its sectarian hearers, would open their mouths, and gulp down like geese, what he pleased to give them. Liberty party is in an awkward dilemma also, while it admits slavery to be an immorality—or sin to be abandoned immediately—and yet in order to abolish this immediately, it swears to support it. Or to get rid of this charge, dishonestly claim the right of private interpretation, or of mental reservation, or doing evil that good may come—i. e., in order to get an influence—to get power, swear to support slavery for the present, hoping by and by to have the Constitution amended. O, they say your comecouters from the church and government ought to quit the country—and the Rev. Charles Ainsworth, Rev. Mr. Porter and Booth, all cried out very cavilously about duty. "Yes, do duty at all events, without regard to consequences"—and yet, turned pale, ghost-like, when a word was said about abolishing slavery from the Methodist church and the government. "Oh, the dreadful consequences," you will have to quit the nation.

There are many men in the Liberty party, sincere friends of the slave, who will not remain in the party long, after they see their position in that party in full fellowship with the oppressor. Many of my choice friends are in that party—many of them members of the American Anti-Slavery society. I know their zeal and devotion to the cause—they have not studied their relation and support to slavery in the church and state through this party as they ought. They wish to have free discussion. No, say the Liberty party leaders, it is dangerous, and henceforth Liberty party meetings are to be closed against free discussion in Windham county, are they? Porter says they are in Massachusetts, and he said the truth—the church and the clergy would not attend, them otherwise. Liberty party meetings in N. York, and throughout the country, are opposed to free discussion—except the discussion be all on their side.

Will the abolitionists of Windham county be cajoled into such a party? I know of some who got their eyes open, at the demonstration which that party made of its character at the meeting in Danielsonville. I speak advisedly, I speak soberly, that if I were to act on the principle of "doing evil that good may come," I would support the whig or democratic party before the Liberty party. Such men as John Q. Adams, are to be honored for their consistency, to say the least, while the Liberty party are grossly inconsistent and immoral, and exhibit a moral degradation which the other parties never dreamed of. Thine truly for the slave, and for "no union with slaveholders."

E. D. H.

From the Ohio State Journal.

THE ABDUCTION CASE.

We learn from the Marietta Intelligencer that an impression prevails that the Grand Jury would not have found a bill against the abducted citizens, had not a witness been found at a late hour, who testified that there was water in their shoes when they were examined on the Virginia shore, and therefore it was concluded they had been in Virginia

water to help the negroes escape. The information contained in the following paragraph from the Intelligencer, will go far to increase the feeling in this State against the slaveholders of Virginia. If the facts are truly represented, we must be permitted to say, without wishing to indulge in mere invective, in so grave a matter, that it exhibits our neighbors in no very favorable light, and proves that they are disposed to add injury to insult. They have already outraged humanity and justice by their proceedings; they will yet learn that they cannot with impunity trample on the rights of citizens of Ohio.

A word about bail. Bail was required in Virginia. A number of citizens of Ohio, men of wealth and character, offered to become responsible to any citizens of Virginia who would bail the prisoners. The indemnifying bond was signed by a large number of our wealthy citizens, and besides this one of the signers offered to give his individual note for the amount of the bail to a citizen of Virginia if he would enter into recognizance for their appearance. Two gentlemen consented to give bonds if a third man could be obtained to engage jointly with them. A young gentleman of unobscured pecuniary responsibility voluntarily offered to do so, but as he was not a freeholder (his property being, at least a portion of it, in bank stock) he was refused. The sum total of the matter is, that after the most importunate entreaties, and although undoubted and abundant security was offered, bail in the sum of fifteen hundred dollars could not be obtained in Virginia; and our citizens, kidnapped by lawless ruffians, must remain in jail until the middle of November before they can be tried—for acts done in this State! Whether they will be tried even then, will probably depend upon the health or disposition of the Prosecuting Attorney.

We may state further, that one of the prisoners, Thomas, is in such feeble health that it is doubted whether he will live until the next session of the Court.

The following item also appears in the Intelligencer. In reference to two of these men we suspect the claim of jurisdiction is as good as that set up in the case of those who are retained in prison in defiance of law and even the semblance of justice. We shall await, however, further developments before we speak of what is here alluded to, promising only that this is the first intimation we have seen of the further proceedings.

FURTHER INDICTMENTS.—The Grand Jury of Wood county, at its session last week not only indicted the three abducted citizens now in Parkersburg jail, but also three others (viz: Barton Stanton, Titus Shetwell, and Joseph Romaine) for being engaged with them in aiding the escape of Harwood's slaves. Stanton and Shetwell are citizens of Ohio. Romaine is now a resident of this State, having removed here from Virginia, some days after the occurrence. It is said that a messenger has been despatched to Richmond for a requisition from the Governor of that State upon Gov. Hartley, of Ohio, for their delivery as fugitives from justice.

Is not this the true reason why the trial of the men now in jail at Parkersburg was postponed?

NOT BY THE BALLOT BOX.—A correspondent of the Christian Reflector writes, June 9th:

"The truth is, and I write it with a glow of hallowed gratitude to God—slavery is dying in Maryland. It may linger, like a serpent with a wonderful head but it must die; I had a conversation yesterday with a Connecticut farmer, who has moved into this region, and is cultivating his lands by free labor. The effect of this single effort is already felt for miles around. Other farmers, natives of the soil, are beginning to profit by his example. In this quiet way, with the assistance of industry, his arguments being those of the plow and the harrow, he is pleading the cause of emancipation, and winning his countrymen to her peaceful standard. Heaven speed such toils."

"A Kentuckian" has written a noble vindication of Cassius M. Clay which we find in the Philadelphia Gazette. The writer denies that the mass of the people of Kentucky justify the conduct of the Lexington mob. He insists that Mr. Clay's views of slavery are "the views of three-fourths of the people of his native State." Nor was the outrage at Lexington so much the result of hostility to the principle advocated by Mr. Clay, as of enmity to him personally. The Wickliffes and Marshalls of that State hate him with a fanatical hatred, and they availed themselves of some indiscreet remarks of their noble victim to accomplish by the fury of a mob what they were too dastard to attempt individually. But what have the miserable cravens gained? The scattered materials of the "True American" will prove to be to the cause of human freedom and liberty of speech, what the blood of the martyrs always has been to religion—the seed from which will spring up millions of zealous advocates of the principle which the Lexington scoundrels have sought by violence and blood, to smother.

LONG YARN.—A rope has been completed in England for the Manchester and Liverpool Railway 3 miles in length, eight inches in circumference, and three tons in weight.

We do not know absolutely what is good or bad fortune.

Although the farmer's life is one of toil, he it is who enjoys a life of true independence, having none of the cares or troubles of other men.